

AWARD FEE DETERMINATION PLAN
For
JIEDDO-COIC Analytical Support Teams (JCAST) Deployable Support
Task Order GST0013AJ0036

This Award Fee Determination Plan is applicable to Period 5,
December 12, 2014 – June 11, 2015

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

This Award Fee Determination Plan (AFDP) provides procedures for evaluating the Contractor's performance on JIEDDO Task Order GST0013AJ0036, on a Cost-Plus-Award-Fee (CPAF) basis. A Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) is a FAR 46.401 requirement; this AFDP replaces the QASP for the work performed on a CPAF basis. The AFDP may be revised unilaterally by the Government at any time during the period of performance. The Government will make every attempt to provide changes to the contractor 15 workdays prior to the start of the evaluation period to which the change will apply. The AFDP may be re-evaluated each evaluation period with input from the Contractor. The award fee objective for this Task Order is to afford the Contractor the opportunity to earn award fee commensurate with optimum performance:

- By providing a workable AFDP with a high probability of successful implementation.
- By clearly communicating evaluation procedures that provide effective two-way communication between the Contractor and the Government.
- By focusing the Contractor on areas of greatest importance to motivate outstanding performance.

The amount of the Award Fee earned and payable to the Contractor for achieving specified levels of performance will be determined by the Award Fee Determination Official (AFDO), with the assistance of the Award Fee Evaluation Board (AFEB), per this Plan. The maximum fee payable for any period is 100% of the Award Fee Allocation. The Contractor may earn all, part, or none of the Award Fee allocated to an evaluation period.

SECTION 2: EVALUATION PERIODS

The Government will evaluate Contractor performance every six months to determine award fee payment. Each CPAF labor Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) will contain two distinct Award Fee Evaluation Periods for a twelve-month period. Mid-Period reviews will be scheduled concurrent with in-process reviews as practicable.

Award Fee Evaluation Periods

CLIN(s)	PERIOD	Award Fee Evaluation Period Dates (Month, Day, Year)
0001	1	June 12, 2013 – September 11, 2013
0001	2	September 12, 2013 – December 11, 2013
0001	3	December 12, 2013 – June 11, 2014
1001	4	June 12, 2014 – December 11, 2014
1001	5	December 12, 2014 – June 11, 2015
2001	6	June 12, 2015 – December 11, 2015
2001	7	December 12, 2015 – June 11, 2016
3001	8	June 12, 2016 – December 11, 2016

The Award Fee periods may be changed at the unilateral discretion of the Government.

SECTION 3: AWARD FEE ALLOCATION FORMULA

3.1 Maximum Award Fee

The maximum award fee pool for Task Order GST0013AJ0036, over the life of the Task Order, is (b) (4)

The maximum award fee allocation determined for each period shall never exceed the matching proportional amount of Award Fee listed in the Task Order Section B CLIN for the applicable period of performance.

3.2 Allowable Allocation Methods

There are two allowable methods to determine the maximum award fee allocation for each period. **The Government uses *Incurred Cost* for the JCAST project and this AFDP.**

3.2.1 Planned Value

Prior to the start of an award fee evaluation period, the AFDP is incorporated into the Task Order by modification, identifying in Section 4 and Section 8:

- Planned Cost for the Award Fee Evaluation Period (SECTION 4).
- Cost Control Criteria (SECTION 8).
- Service Level Agreements on Cost Control encouraging reductions in cost to achieve higher award fee and/or higher return on sale (SECTION 8).

3.2.2 Incurred Cost

In the absence of a documented Planned Value, the award fee pool allocation shall be based on the *incurred cost* for the period. Incurred cost data shall be provided by the Contractor after the end of the Award Fee Evaluation Period, as calculated and reported by the Contractor's approved Cost Accounting System. Invoiced cost shall not be used unless incurred cost is not available.

3.3 Prohibited Allocation Methods

3.3.1 Funded Cost

Funded cost will inherently exceed incurred cost. Award Fee Allocation Pools based on the funded cost would artificially increase the total effective award fee percentage higher than the negotiated amount at award. Funded cost shall never be utilized.

3.3.2 Estimated Cost

Estimated costs at award will inherently exceed incurred cost. Award Fee Allocation Pools based on the estimated cost would artificially increase the total award fee percentage higher than the negotiated amount at award. Estimated cost shall never be utilized.

3.3.3 Equal Distribution

Equal distribution of the maximum award fee pool inherently deviates from the award fee percentage negotiated at award. Planned value and incurred cost are superior methodologies to provide a consistent and fair award fee allocation pool. Equal distribution shall never be utilized.

3.3.4 Weighted Distribution

Weighted distribution of the maximum award fee pool inherently deviates from the award fee percentage negotiated at award. Planned Value and Incurred Cost are superior methodologies to provide a consistent and fair award fee allocation pool that correspond inherently to high levels of effort. Weighted distribution shall never be utilized.

3.4 First Award Fee Evaluation Period

The first award fee evaluation period for all CPAF awards will default to utilizing incurred cost to determine the award fee allocation. Transition activities inherently introduce level of effort variation. A Planned Value cannot be determined prior to award. Subsequent award fee evaluation periods should progress towards Planned Value.

SECTION 4: AWARD FEE PLANNED VALUE / RESULTS REPORTING

4.1 Initial Award Fee Evaluation Period

The Award Fee Planned Value/Results Reporting Table is completed after the end of the first Award Fee Evaluation Period. The fields to be completed are Cost Incurred, Available Award Fee Pool Allocation, Earned Fee, and Unearned Fee.

4.2 Second and Subsequent Award Fee Evaluation Period

If the Award Fee Allocation methodology is progressing from Incurred Cost to Planned Value, the Planned Value amount shall be recorded in the table below prior to the start of the section evaluation period. As noted in Section 3.2, the Government uses *Incurred Cost* for this AFDP.

The Available Award Fee Pool Allocation, Earned Fee, and Unearned Fee are completed after each award fee period to record results. If Planned Value allocation was not used, the default Cost Incurred will be reported at the end of the award fee period.

Award Fee Planned Value/Results Reporting Table

Year	Period	Planned Value	Cost Incurred	Award Fee Pool Allocation	Earned Award Fee	Unearned Fee
Base Year	1	N/A	(b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)
Base Year	2	N/A	(b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)
Base Year	3	N/A	(b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)
Option Year 1	4	N/A	(b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)
Option Year 1	5	N/A	(b) (4)			
Option Year 2	6	N/A				
Option Year 2	7	N/A				
Option Year 3	8	N/A				
Extended Period TBD	TBD	N/A				

SECTION 5 - AWARD FEE EVALUATION RATINGS

The following table shows the allocation percentage by scores. The definition for each rating adjective is shown in Section 3.3. *(The percentages in this section are prescribed in FAR 16.401(e)(3)(iv).)*

Rating	Percentage of Fee
Excellent	91%-100%
Very Good	76%-90%
Good	51%-75%
Satisfactory	No Greater than 50%
Unsatisfactory	0%

The performance categories, once graded, describe the overall customer satisfaction with the tasks' key indicators. Contained in the ratings is a word picture of standards that allows each monitor to work from a common grading scale. *(The adjectival ratings and descriptions in this section are prescribed in FAR 16.401(e)(3)(iv). Per that section of the FAR, the Contracting Officer may choose to supplement the adjectival rating descriptions included in this section.)* Adjectival ratings used in this Award Fee Plan use "Outstanding" to replace "excellent," and use "Excellent" to replace "very good."

OUTSTANDING

Contractor has exceeded almost all of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the AFDP for the award-fee evaluation period.

EXCELLENT

Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the AFDP for the award-fee evaluation period.

GOOD

Contractor has exceeded some of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the AFDP for the award-fee evaluation period.

SATISFACTORY

Contractor has met overall, cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the AFDP for the award fee evaluation period.

UNSATISFACTORY

Contractor has failed to meet overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the AFDP for the award-fee evaluation period.

SECTION 6: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF AWARD FEE DETERMINATION

6.1 Award Fee Determination Official (AFDO)

The AFDO is the FEDSIM Group Manager. The Contracting Officer (CO) will appoint the AFDO in writing.

The AFDO's responsibilities are:

- Approve the AFDP and authorize any changes to the AFDP throughout the life of the Task Order.
- Approve the members of the AFEB and appoint the AFEB Chairperson.
- Review assessments of Contractor performance. Feedback coordinated with the AFEB will be provided to the Contractor as appropriate during the evaluation period to enhance overall performance and minimize problems.
- Determine the amount of award fee the Contractor has earned based on its performance during each evaluation period.

6.2 Award Fee Evaluation Board (AFEB)

The AFEB has a Chairperson, Client Representatives and/or Technical Point of Contact(s) (TPOCs). Other voting members of the board are the FEDSIM Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) and representatives from the Client Organization. The FEDSIM CO is a non-voting advisory member of the AFEB. Additional non-voting board members may be Performance Monitors as deemed appropriate by the AFEB Chairperson. The following table provides the individuals that are members of the AFEB. Substitutions are permitted in the event of a schedule conflict, subject to approval by the AFEB Chairperson. Attendance of the non-voting members is not required to convene a board.

Board Position	Name and Title
Chairperson	James McCarl, Chief, JIEDDO Mission Integration Division, TPOC for JCAST
AFEB Voting Member	Mark Libby, Business Operations Officer, JIEDDO Contracts Branch, TPOC for Business Operations
AFEB Voting Member	Steve Martin, Deputy Chief, JIEDDO/ MID
AFEB Voting Member	Tal Dredge, COR, FEDSIM
AFEB Voting Member **	
AFEB Non-Voting Member	FEDSIM Contracting Officer

** Optional seats. The AFEB Chairperson may appoint as many AFEB Voting members as desired but must have three voting members in addition to the Chairperson.

Non-voting members will participate in AFEB assessments of Performance Monitor evaluations and discussions of award fee recommendations. Additionally, non-voting members are allowed to submit written reports on Contractor performance to the AFEB for its consideration.

The responsibilities of the AFEB are:

- a. Recommend to the AFDO the specific elements upon which the Contractor will be evaluated for each evaluation period.
- b. Request and obtain performance information from Performance Monitors involved in observing Contractor performance.
- c. Evaluate the Contractor's performance and summarize its findings and recommendations for the AFDO.
- d. Recommend to the AFDO the percentage of award fee available during an evaluation period which the Contractor should receive.

6.2.1 AFEB Chairperson

The responsibilities of the AFEB Chairperson are to:

- a. Conduct AFEB meetings.
- b. Resolve any inconsistencies in the AFEB evaluations.
- c. Ensure AFEB recommendations to the AFDO are timely and made in accordance with the Award Fee Agreement and this Plan.
- d. Ensure timely payment of award fee earned by the Contractor.
- e. Recommend any changes to the AFDP to the AFDO.
- f. Ensure and have overall responsibility for the proper execution of the AFDP including managing the activities of the AFEB.
- g. Exerts overall responsibility for all documents and activities associated with the AFEB.
- h. Maintain the award fee files, including current copy of the AFDP, any internal procedures, Performance Monitor's reports, and any other documentation having a bearing on the AFDO's award fee decisions.

6.2.2 Performance Monitors

Government and Task Order support personnel will be identified by the AFEB Chairperson as Performance Monitors to aid the AFEB in making its recommendation for award fee.

Performance Monitors (responsible for the technical administration of specific tasks issued under the Contract) document the Contractor's performance against evaluation criteria in their assigned evaluation areas(s). The primary responsibilities of the Performance Monitors include:

- Monitoring, evaluating, and assessing Contractor performance in assigned areas.
- Preparing evaluation reports (scorecards) that ensure a fair and accurate portrayal of the Contractor's performance.
- Recommending changes to the AFDP to the AFEB Chairperson.

These Performance Monitors will submit written reports, as required by the AFEB Chairperson, on the Contractor's performance to the AFEB for consideration. Submission of their reports will be coordinated through the AFEB Chairperson. Procedures and instructions for the Performance Monitors regarding midterm and final evaluations are provided below. The final report will be

comprehensive and will be completed and submitted to the AFEB Chairperson in a timely manner.

SECTION 7: AWARD FEE DETERMINATION PROCESS

The Contractor begins each evaluation period with zero percent of the available award fee and works up to the earned award fee based on performance during the evaluation period.

7.1 Monitoring and Assessing Performance

The AFEB Chairperson will assign Performance Monitors for the major performance areas. The Performance Monitors will be selected on the basis of their expertise in the prescribed performance areas and/or their association with specific technical tasks. The AFEB Chairperson may assign and change Performance Monitors assignments at any time without notice to the Contractor. The AFEB Chairperson will ensure that each Monitor and board member has copies of the Task Order and all modifications, a copy of this Plan, and all changes and specific instructions for assigned areas.

Performance Monitors will conduct assessments of the Contractor performance in their assigned areas. Feedback coordinated with the AFEB Chairperson will be provided to the Contractor as appropriate during the evaluation period to enhance overall performance and minimize problems.

7.1.1 Instructions for Performance Monitors

Performance Monitors will maintain a periodic written record of the Contractor's performance, including inputs from other Government personnel, in the evaluation areas of responsibility. Performance Monitors will retain informal records used to prepare evaluation reports for 12 months after the completion of an evaluation period to support any inquiries made by the AFDO. Performance Monitors will conduct assessments in an open, objective, and cooperative spirit, so that a fair and accurate evaluation is made. Performance Monitors will make every effort to be consistent from period to period in their approach to determine recommended ratings. Positive accomplishments should be emphasized just as readily as negative ones.

- a. Performance Monitor Evaluation Reports. Performance Monitors will prepare midterm and final evaluation reports for each evaluation period during which they are Performance Monitors. The final reports will be more comprehensive. The reports, as a minimum, contain the following information:
 1. The criteria and methods used to evaluate the Contractor's performance during the evaluation period.
 2. The technical, economic, and schedule environment under which the Contractor was required to perform. What effect did the environment have on the Contractor's performance?
 3. The Contractor's major strengths and weaknesses during the evaluation period. Give examples of the Contractor performance for each strength and weakness listed. Also provide the reference in the specification, statement of work, data requirement, task order, etc. that relates to each strength or weakness.

4. A recommended rating for the evaluation period using the adjectives and their definitions set forth in this AFDP. Provide concrete examples of the Contractor's performance to support the recommended rating.

7.2 Exclusions

Throughout the entire evaluation period, the Contractor shall present and document any exclusion to the period of performance, due to circumstances beyond the control of the Contractor, to the AFEB Chairperson within 10 days of the end of the Award Fee Period. The Performance Monitors should present the exclusions (if any) to the AFEB. If necessary, the AFEB will ask the Contractor to present its case. The AFEB, in conjunction with the FEDSIM CO, will make a unilateral decision as to the exclusion from the evaluation.

7.3 Contractor Monthly Performance Reports

The Contractor shall prepare Monthly Performance Reports that contains data that can be used to compare against the Performance Standards stated in this AFDP. All Performance Reports, including the raw data, shall be provided to the designated Performance Monitors.

Performance Monitors will collect the Monthly Performance Reports from the Contractor, which they will review and analyze for accuracy and, if required, provide an oral or written summary to the AFEB.

7.4 Midterm Evaluation Procedures

The purpose of the midterm evaluation is to provide the Contractor a quick, concise, interim Government review of Contractor performance, and provide the Contractor an opportunity to improve its performance prior to the determination of award fee earned at the end of the evaluation period. No award fee is paid based on midterm evaluations.

7.5 Final Evaluation Reports

The Performance Monitors will provide evaluations for the entire six-month evaluation period. Performance Monitors will submit final evaluation reports after the end date of the evaluation period to the AFEB Chairperson.

7.6 Contractor Self Evaluation Presentation

The Contractor may prepare a written self-assessment against the AFDP, along with the option of presenting the results to the AFEB upon request. This presentation should last no longer than one hour. If necessary, a subsequent question-and-answer session is permissible.

7.7 AFEB Meeting and Memorandum to the AFDO

The AFEB, after receipt of the Contractor's self-evaluation, will meet and evaluate all performance information it has obtained. The AFEB will review the Performance Monitors' reports and prepare an Award Fee Evaluation Report. The Report will be a memorandum to the AFDO with the AFEB's recommendation.

7.8 AFEB Final Report

After meeting with the Contractor, the AFEB will finalize the report and present it to the AFDO. The report will recommend the award fee amount and any unresolved Contractor issues to the AFDO.

7.9 Issuing Award Fee Determination Report

The AFDO will consider the final AFEB report and ensure compliance with the AFDP. The AFDO may accept, reject, or modify the AFEB recommendation. The AFDO will make the final determination of the award fee earned during the period. The AFDO's determination of the amount of award fee earned and the basis of the determination will be stated in an Award Fee Determination Report and forwarded to the FEDSIM CO for the Task Order file via modification.

7.10 Award Fee Determination Notice

The FEDSIM CO will prepare this notice to the Contractor stating the amount of the award fee earned for the evaluation period. The Contractor shall invoice after accepting the modification including the award fee determination and any corresponding deobligation of unearned fee.

7.11 Failure to Conduct Timely Award Fee Determinations

If the Government fails to complete the Award Fee Determination within three calendar months of the end of the Award Fee Evaluation Period for two separate periods, the Government will convert the Cost-Plus-Award-Fee CLINs for the remaining periods of performance to Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee. The Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee type will be term. The fixed fee amount will be the same percentage as negotiated for award fee (limited by the statutory limit of 10 percent).

SECTION 8: EVALUATION CRITERIA AND WEIGHTS

The AFDP consists of award fee provisions for four distinct areas. The award fee areas are broken down as follows:

20%	Program Management
80%	Deployable C-IED and Attack the Network Support
[10%]	Transition (When Applicable)
<hr/>	
100%	Total

The criteria and weights provided above and discussed in detail below are guidelines to be used in evaluating these areas to determine the appropriate award fee. The criteria and relative percentages may be adjusted for subsequent award fee periods. Members of the AFEB and working group will use the following examples of criteria to evaluate the Contractor's performance during each award fee evaluation period.

Service Level Agreements (SLAs) and other subjective criteria may be revised for subsequent award fee periods. Those future SLAs will be developed jointly by the Contractor and Government and may replace some or all of the criteria listed below. The Government has the final say as to what SLAs will be incorporated.

8.1 Criteria 1: Program Management – 20%

The objective of the Program Management criteria is to provide an incentive to Lockheed Martin to achieve optimum performance of Task 1, Section C.4.1, requirements and objectives. The performance criteria are further defined in the Performance Requirements Summary.

8.2 Criteria 2: Deployable C-IED and AtN Support – 80%

The objective of the Deployable C-IED and AtN support criteria is to provide an incentive to Lockheed Martin to achieve optimum performance of Tasks 2 and 3, Sections C.4.2 and C.4.3, requirements and objectives. The performance criteria are further defined in the Performance Requirements Summary.

8.3 Criteria 3: Transition (In and Out) – 10% (when applicable)

The objective of the Transition criteria is to provide an incentive to Lockheed Martin to achieve optimum performance of Task 4, Section C.4.4, requirements and objectives. The performance criteria are further defined in the Performance Requirements Summary. Transition is weighted as 10% of the overall evaluation in the years in which it is applicable (base year and final year). Each transition is weighted 100% in applicable years and 0% in non-applicable years.

APPENDIX 1: AFEB SUMMARY EVALUATION REPORT

Date:

AFEB Chairperson Name:

Award Fee Period: from _____ to _____

(Attach additional pages, supporting data, etc. as needed.)

Program Management: (Rating Adjective/Performance Points)

Discussion:

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Deployable C-IED and AtN Support: (Rating Adjective/Performance Points)

Discussion:

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Transition: (Rating Adjective/Performance Points)

Discussion:

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Award fee rating recommended for this evaluation criteria and period of performance with recommended percentage earned.

AFB Chairperson Signature: _____

APPENDIX 2: AFEB EVALUATOR'S REPORT

Instructions: Evaluators are requested to use a bulletized format for submitting strengths, weaknesses and recommendations. Also, evaluators are encouraged to attach additional sheets, supporting data, etc. for the final report.

Date:

Evaluator Name and Title:

Award Fee Period: from _____ to _____

Evaluator's Primary Task Area(s) (check all that apply):

<input type="checkbox"/>	Program Management
<input type="checkbox"/>	Deployable C-IED and AtN Support
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transition

Note: Evaluators are NOT limited to evaluating only their own task areas. Experiences in other areas should also be evaluated. However, please indicate in the boxes above your primary area(s) of responsibility.

Special Circumstances during this period and their impact:

Strengths of the Contractor's performance:

Weaknesses in the Contractor's performance (with examples and contract references):

Impact of the Contractor's performance on execution of the program:

Corrective actions recommended, if any:

Award fee rating recommended for this evaluation criteria and period of performance (with supporting examples):

Evaluator Signature: _____

APPENDIX 3: PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS SUMMARY

Program Management [Weight: 20%]				
Desired Outcome: The Contractor achieves the Desired Outcomes of this Task Order and delivers performance within cost and schedule constraints.				
Required Services: See Section C.4.1, Task 1 Provide Program Management				
Performance Measures	Weighting (%)	Acceptable Quality Level (AQL)	Monitoring Method	Incentives/Deterrents
SLA #1 - Cost Tracking to Plan	90%	<p>Quantitative: Deviation from cost plan shall not exceed +/-5% (80%)</p> <p>Qualitative: LM accurately projects and controls costs, and provides timely notification. COR and TPOC are notified of potential cost overruns and corrective actions in a timely manner. (20%)</p>	<p>The Government will monitor the variance between the project budget or cost estimates at the start of the award period (BAC) and actual costs at the end of the award period (Estimate at Completion = Actual Cost), less the cost of unforeseen Government-directed deviations during the award period.</p> <p>TPOC and COR review of monthly reports, invoices, and IPRs. LM will provide the summary data with details available to the Government to minimize administrative burden.</p>	<p>Outstanding: Deviation from plan does not exceed +/- 3% LM notifies the Government the week following discovery of potential over-runs.</p> <p>Excellent: Deviation from plan does not exceed +/- 3.5% LM notifies the Government within two weeks following discovery of potential over-runs.</p> <p>Good: Deviation from plan does not exceed +/- 4% LM notifies the Government of potential over-runs at the IPR.</p> <p>Satisfactory: AQL is met.</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Deviation from plan is greater than +/- 5%</p>
<p>SLA #2 - Effectiveness of Program Management</p> <p>Includes timeliness and accuracy of requests for travel, tools, and ODC expenses; accuracy of invoices; personnel management; responsiveness to task requirements,</p>	10%	Quantitative: 95% of Travel Authorizations (TAs), Requests to Initiate Purchase (RIPs), invoices, and other deliverables from Section F of the task order are timely and accepted on the first submission. (75%)	The number of accepted deliverables that were delivered on the due date, divided by the total number of deliverables due during the period. Percent of Request to Initiate Purchase (RIP) or Travel Authorization (TA)	<p>Outstanding: 99+% of deliverables are timely and accepted on the first submission.</p> <p>Excellent: 98% of deliverable are timely and accepted on the first submission</p>

Program Management [Weight: 20%]				
<p>etc. Travel Authorizations (TAs), Requests to Initiate Purchase (RIPs), invoices, and other deliverables from Section F of the task order are timely and accepted on the first submission.</p> <p>This measure does not address RFSs</p>		<p>Qualitative: Deliverables contain useful information presented in a logical and intuitive format. Analysis-type deliverables show evidence of data collection and analysis. Documentation-type deliverables contain complete, accurate, and relevant information. Recommendations are realistic, proactive, and solve identified problems. Deliverables are presented in a professional manner (properly formatted, few typographical errors, consistent formatting). Customer and stakeholder relationships are positive and effective. Support requests are responded to in a timely manner and follow-up actions are accomplished by due dates. Problems are reported in a timely manner, and recommended solutions are presented concurrently. (25%)</p> <p>This measure does not address RFSs.</p>	<p>documents returned for correction; percent and dollar value of errors on invoices.</p> <p>COR and TPOC inspection of individual TAs, RIPs, invoices, and other deliverables.</p>	<p>Good: 97% of deliverable are timely and accepted on the first submission</p> <p>Satisfactory: 95% of deliverables are timely and accepted on the first submission</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: <95% of deliverables are timely and accepted on the first submission.</p>

Provide Deployable C-IED and AtN Support and Optional Task 3 (Surge Option) [Weight: (80%)]				
Desired Outcome: JIEDDO-COIC satisfies 100% of the requirements for organic support to field operating commanders for C-IED and AtN operations. Operations and intelligence fusion, analysis, training, and “sensitive activity support” to the COIC, Combatant Commanders, and coalition partners enables freedom of maneuver from IEDs and enhances a collective ability to counter threat networks and supporting activities (Goal 2, JIEDDO Strategic Plan 2012-2016). A cadre of trained and experienced experts is maintained to provide a reach back capability and a rotational base for the forward element.				
Required Services: See Section C.4.2, Task 2. Provide Deployable C-IED and AtN Support and Optional Task 3 (Surge Option)				
Performance Measures	Weighting (%)	Acceptable Quality Level (AQL)	Monitoring Method	Incentives/Deterrents
SLA # 3 Operational Availability (Ao) of qualified deployed analysts	40%	100% of deployed analyst billets are filled with qualified staff (i.e., meet education, experience, and training requirements) .	<p>This measurement will coincide with the government-identified staffing needs of deployed analysts, and will be taken on the last day of each month. Similarly to the previous measurements, the score for each month within the Award Fee period will be averaged to determine the overall score for a given Award Fee period.</p> <p>The Government will identify time-phased staffing needs indicating the number and qualifications of deployed staff over time. The contractor fill rate will be monitored monthly and compared to the time-phased staffing needs. LM will provide the summary data with details available to the Government to minimize administrative burden.</p>	<p>Outstanding: AQL is met, and qualified replacements are identified at least 45 days in advance.</p> <p>Excellent: AQL is met, and qualified replacements are identified at least 30 days in advance.</p> <p>Good: AQL is met, and qualified replacements are identified at least 15 days in advance.</p> <p>Satisfactory: AQL is met</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Less than 100% Ao of qualified deployed analysts</p>
SLA # 4 Latest Time of Value (LTOV) Provide operationally relevant and	30%	99% of products and reports in the reporting period delivered within LTOV	LM will monitor the date of submission of products and reports compared to the agreed LTOV, and provide a monthly	Outstanding: 100% on time products and reports in the reporting period.

Provide Deployable C-IED and AtN Support and Optional Task 3 (Surge Option) [Weight: (80%)]				
timely operations-intelligence fusion, analytical support, and training integration to enable Combatant Commanders to attack threat networks. (JIEDDO 2012 Strategic Plan, Objective 2.2)			summary report to the government at IPR. LTOV dates revised by the Government for internal Government reasons are included in agreed LTOV. LTOV dates revised due to LM not providing acceptable products at original LTOV are considered to have not been delivered within LTOV.	<p>Satisfactory: 99% on-time products and reports in the reporting period</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Less than 99% of products and reports in the reporting period delivered within LTOV</p>
<p>SLA # 5 RFS Quality</p> <p>Compliance with JIEDDO-COIC and IC classification standards, compliance with COIC templates and processes, and data entry in COSE and the RFS tracker. RFS products can be tracked by individual and team and are color coded from Red (critical defects) to Green (no issues). Only those RFS for which a JCAST-assigned individual is lead are counted in this metric.</p>	30%	<p>90% of RFS products for which JCAST team is lead receive a good or only minor issue rating in Administrative Process Review (80%).</p> <p>90% of RFS products for which JCAST team is lead have complete entries in COSE (20%)</p>	Audits conducted by MID staff on RFS products evaluate compliance with JIEDDO-COIC and IC classification standards, compliance with COIC templates and processes, and data entry in COSE and the RFS tracker. Reports are provided to MID month	<p>Outstanding: 96% of RFS products receive a good/minor issue rating and are entered in COSE.</p> <p>Excellent: 94% of RFS products receive a good/minor issue rating and are entered in COSE</p> <p>Good: 92% of RFS products receive a good/minor issue rating and are entered in COSE</p> <p>Satisfactory: AQL is met.</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Less than 90% of RFS products receive a good/minor issue rating and are entered in COSE</p>

Transition In and Transition Out [Weight: 10% When Activated]				
Desired Outcomes: The Contractor achieves the Desired Outcomes of this Task Order and delivers performance within cost and schedule constraints. JIEDDO-COIC Deployable JCAST C-IED and AtN Support is continued in a controlled and deliberate manner throughout transition. Steady-state operations are resumed within 30 days of task order award and the end of task transition is planned and managed.				
Required Services: See Section C.4.4, Task 4, Provide Transition Support				
Performance Measures	Performance Measures	Acceptable Quality Level (AQL)	Monitoring Method	Incentives/Deterrents
<p>This Performance Measure is in effect only during the first award period after task order award. Achieve steady state operations within 30 days after award of the task order.</p> <p>A steady state operation is intended to be the milestone in which all performance measures are in force.</p>	100% in period one	<p>Achieve 90% staffed at the end of the first 30 days (aligns with P-level 1, as defined in AR-220_1, 90%)</p> <p>Notes: “Staffed” is defined as approved, hired, and in processed at COIC.</p> <p>Steady State (SS) is defined as P-level 1, or 90% staffed.</p>	LM will provide the summary data with details available to the Government to allow monitoring and validation each month at the IPR	<p>Incentive:</p> <p>Outstanding: Greater than 99% staffed on day 1</p> <p>Excellent: SS on day 1</p> <p>Good: SS on day 15</p> <p>Satisfactory: AQL is met</p> <p>Deterrent:</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: AQL not met</p>
<p>This Performance Measure is in effect only during the last 6 months of the task order period of performance.</p> <p>The Contractor shall ensure a smooth transition to a new Contractor with no disruption to vital Government business.</p>	100% in final period	100% of Transition Deliverables on time	LM will provide the summary data with details available to the Government to allow monitoring and validation each month at the IPR	<p>Incentive:</p> <p>Outstanding – 15 days early</p> <p>Excellent – 10 days early</p> <p>Good – 5 days early</p> <p>Satisfactory: AQL is met.</p> <p>Deterrent:</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: 1 or more Transition Deliverables not delivered on time</p>